

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/748,148

Applicant(s)

OKUYAMA ET AL.

ExaminerJYOTHSNA A. VENKAT Ph.
D**Art Unit**

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT Ph. D.

(3) _____

(2) DAVID STITZEL

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: DECLARATION FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSE.

Claim(s) discussed: as of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: As of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Interview Record JK 1/22/08

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

J. Venkat
JYOTHSNA VENKAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500-1600

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney showed examiner declaration that would be submitted in response to the final rejection. Examiner informed the attorney that the declaration will not be entered since it will not be timely filed. Examiner reviewed the declaration and informed the attorney that the showing in the declaration is not commensurate with the scope of claims since the declaration showed results using candelilla wax with specific melting point as the oil soluble resin and no other resin was tested. Declaration does not have results with respect to end points drawn to thickness of the fiber and length and also weight percent of the fiber. Declaration showed results for fibers treated with silica and fibers treated with 5 % perfluoroalkyl silane and this compound is very specific to formula (2) of JP '932, wherein X is -OCH₂CH₃ ANS a=4, b=2, c=1 and JP '932 teaches different fluorine compounds and declaration did not show results for untreated polypropylene fiber without silica, therefore the testing in the declaration is not commensurate with the scope of claims .